REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the following discussion and in view of the present amendment, is respectfully requested.

Claim 21 is amended for a minor grammatical error. Claims 1, 2, 4, 11-15, 19-27, 29 and 30 are pending.

Entry of Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116

The Applicant requests entry of this Rule 116 Response because: the amendments were not earlier presented because the Applicant believed in good faith that the cited references did not disclose the present invention as previously claimed; and the amendment places the application at least into a better form for purposes of appeal.

The Manual of Patent Examining Procedures (M.P.E.P.) sets forth in Section 714.12 that "any amendment that would place the case either in condition for allowance or in better form for appeal may be entered." Moreover, Section 714.13 sets forth that "the Proposed Amendment should be given sufficient consideration to determine whether the claims are in condition for allowance and/or whether the issues on appeal are simplified." The M.P.E.P. further articulates that the reason for any non-entry should be explained expressly in the Advisory Action.

I.   **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

In the Office Action, at pages 2-22, numbered paragraphs 3-6, claims 1, 2, 4, 11-15, 19-27, 29 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over various combinations of DE 10114950 to Goertz Werner ("Werner"), U.S. Patent No. 5,224,156 to Fuller et al., and U.S. Patent No. 6,442,243 to Valco, and U.S. Patent No. 5,438,433 to Reifman et al.

These rejections are respectfully traversed because the combination of the teachings of Werner and Fuller does not suggest:

> storing the received and displayed SMS short messages in a
> predetermined address of a memory unit of the facsimile machine
> or the multifunctional device operating in the wired network, by
> tabling a sequence and the contents of the messages, according
> to a user selection; and
>
> printing the stored SMS short messages according to the user
> selection,

as recited in amended independent claim 1.

As conceded by the Examiner, Werner does not discuss or suggest that the short message SMS that is received at the fax machine FAX is stored in a predetermined address of a memory unit of the fax machine according to a user's selection by tabling a sequence and the contents of the message and Werner does not suggest that SMS messages that are received and displayed (i.e., inherently stored in some kind of memory in the facsimile device) are thereafter stored in a predetermined address in a memory unit. Further, Werner does not suggest that the received and displayed messages are stored in the memory unit according to a user's selection.

The Examiner indicates that Fuller makes up for the deficiencies in Werner. The Applicants respectfully disagree.

Fuller discusses a method and apparatus for causing a message sent in a facsimile compatible form over a telephone system from a first location to a second location to be received at the second location in a confidential manner such that only the intended recipient may view the message when the user so desires. Fuller discusses that the user can cause a facsimile message sent to him to be delivered to a memory location and not be printed out on the facsimile machine until he is present and provides a proper code which allows the facsimile message to be printed only in his presence.

While Fuller discusses that a user can store a facsimile message to a memory location and print the message at a later time, Fuller does not discuss or suggest storing an SMS short message to a memory location to be printed at a later time.

The present specification at paragraph 0005 clarifies that short messages received from an SMSC can be confirmed on a display window attached to a telephone, and the received short messages cannot be printed. Therefore, there is a difficulty in managing received SMS short messages.

The Examiner alleges only that it would have been obvious to combine Werner and Fuller "since in doing so that user has the option of allowing the message to be printed only in his presence (column 2, lines 51-52), thus increasing security and minimizing possible threats." However, such an apparent reason does not suggest why SMS short messages would be stored to a memory location and then later printed by a user. The apparent reason suggests only why the user would want to delay printing a facsimile message, but does not suggest why one of ordinary skill in the art would specifically store SMS short messages in a memory to later be printed.

In addition, while Fuller discusses that the fax apparatus 10 will intercept incoming confidential information or messages and store the confidential messages in an appropriate mailbox in first memory means 24, Fuller does not discuss or suggest storing received and displayed SMS short messages to a memory, according to a user's selection.

Fuller specifically discusses notifying a user that a facsimile messages has been received and placed in a memory location. However, this therefore teaches away from storing received and displayed SMS short messages. In Fuller, the user sets up the operation of incoming messages so that the incoming messages go directly to memory for later retrieval.

In contrast, as discussed at paragraph 0007 of the present specification, the SMS short messages are displayed on a display window, selectively stored, printed and deleted, such that an area occupied by the SMS short messages in a memory unit can be minimized, a waste of resources can be eliminated and the SMS short messages can be managed in a document format. By saving the SMS short messages to a memory unit according to a user selection after they have been received and displayed, the short messages can be managed in a document format.

Fuller does not suggest that the user is able to analyze whether to store, print or delete received short messages such that an area occupied by the SMS short messages in a memory unit can be minimized. Fuller suggests storing all confidential messages in a memory unit, but does not suggest that a user is able to distinguish between what is necessary to store in a memory location and what is not necessary to store, so that memory storage space is not wasted, by reviewing the messages in advance (because they are displayed to the user).

Further, the apparent reason for combining the references cited by the Examiner does not suggest why Werner/Fuller would store received and displayed SMS short messages. As discussed above, Fuller teaches away from storing displayed messages because all confidential messages are stored to a memory location, particularly without the user viewing them.

Valco and Reifman fail to make up for the deficiencies in Werner and Fuller.

Therefore, as the combination of the teachings of Werner and Fuller does not suggest "storing the received and displayed SMS short messages in a predetermined address of a memory unit of the facsimile machine or the multifunctional device operating in the wired network, by tabling a sequence and the contents of the messages, according to a user selection; [and] printing the received SMS short messages according to the user selection," as recited in amended independent claim 1, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the references relied upon. Accordingly, withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Also, the combination of the teachings of Werner and Fuller does not suggest "storing the received and displayed SMS short messages in a predetermined address of a memory unit of the facsimile machine or the multifunctional device operating in the wired network, by tabling a sequence and the contents of the messages, according to a user selection; and printing the stored SMS short messages according to the user selection," as recited in amended independent claim 13. Thus, claim 13 patentably distinguishes over the references relied upon. Accordingly, withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Further, the combination of the teachings of Werner and Fuller does not suggest "storing the received and displayed SMS short messages in a predetermined address of a memory unit of the printing apparatus operating in the wired network by tabling a sequence and the contents of the messages, and printing the received and stored SMS short messages," as recited in amended independent claim 21. Thus, claim 21 patentably distinguishes over the references relied upon. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

In addition, the combination of the teachings of Werner and Fuller does not suggest "an SMS interface...storing the received and displayed SMS short messages in a predetermined address of a memory unit of the printing apparatus operating in the wired network, by tabling a sequence and the contents of the messages, according to a user selection; [and] a printer printing the received and stored SMS short messages according to the user selection," as recited in amended independent claim 23. Thus, claim 23 patentably distinguishes over the references relied upon. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Additionally, the combination of the teachings of Werner and Fuller does not suggest "a programmed computer processor according to a user selection...storing the displayed SMS short messages through a wired network from the SMS center in a predetermined address of a memory unit of the printing device operating in the wired network by tabling a sequence and the contents of the messages, selectively providing the received SMS short messages, and printing the stored SMS messages according to the user selection to allow managing the received SMS short messages in a document format," as recited in amended independent claim 27. Thus, claim 27 patentably distinguishes over the references relied upon. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Further, the combination of the teachings of Werner and Fuller does not suggest "storing the received and displayed SMS short messages in a predetermined address of a memory unit of the facsimile machine or the multifunctional device operating in the wired network, by tabling a

sequence and the contents of the messages, according to a user selection; and printing the received and stored SMS short messages according to the user selection," as recited in amended independent claim 29. Thus, claim 29 patentably distinguishes over the references relied upon. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 4, 11, 12, 14, 15, 19, 20, 22, 24-26 and 30 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claims 1, 13, 21, 23, 27 and 29 and include all the features of their respective independent claims, plus additional features that are not discussed or suggested by the references relied upon. Therefore, claims 2, 4, 11, 12, 14, 15, 19, 20, 22, 24-26 and 30 patentably distinguish over the references relied upon for at least the reasons noted above. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 2, 4, 11-15, 19-27, 29 and 30 are pending and under consideration.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: _Feb 18, 2010_

By: _Gregory W. Harper_
Gregory W. Harper
Registration No. 55,248

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501